UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

JENNIFER F.,

Plaintiff

v.

ANDREW SAUL, Commissioner Social Security Administration,

Defendant

No. 1:19-CV-00547-MSM-PAS

ORDER

Mary S. McElroy, United States District Judge.

This matter is before the Court on the Plaintiff's Motion to Reverse and Remand, (ECF No. 11) and the Defendant's Motion to Affirm (ECF No. 15), the denial by an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) of Disability Insurance Benefits under 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) of the Social Security Act and Supplemental Security Income under § 1631(c)(3). The Plaintiff filed an Objection to the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Patricia A. Sullivan (ECF No. 16) which had recommended that the Court deny the Motion to Reverse and grant the Motion to Affirm.

Although the Plaintiff claimed both physical and mental disabilities, the dispute here concerns the impact of mental health diagnoses, as she accepted the ALJ's decision with respect to physical disabilities. (ECF No. 16, p. 1, n.2). She

contested before the Magistrate Judge, and does so again in this Court, the ALJ's

conclusion that she was not disabled because her residual functional capacity was

such that she could successfully work at a sufficient number of jobs available in the

economy. (ECF No. 6-2, p. 32). She argues that the ALJ's conclusions were not

supported by substantial evidence. (ECF Nos. 11, 17).

My review of those portions of the Report & Recommendation that are objected-

to is de novo. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, my review of the record is not de novo.

Like the Magistrate-Judge, I am bound to accept and give deference to those findings

and conclusions of the ALJ that are supported by substantial evidence. Tsarelka v.

Sec'y of Health & Human Servs., 842 F.2d 529, 535 (1st Cir. 1988). I have reviewed

the record and adopt the reasoning and conclusions of the Magistrate-Judge that the

ALJ decision rested on a foundation of substantial evidence.

The Court therefore DENIES the Motion to Reverse and Remand (ECF No. 11)

and GRANTS the Motion to Affirm (ECF No. 15).

IT IS SO ORDERED:

Date: November 4, 2020